UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,178	09/17/2003	Won-Kyu Jang	P2032US	5559

8968 7590 08/17/2007

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
ATTN: PATENT DOCKET DEPT.
191 N. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 3700
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER	
MADDEN, GREGORY VINCENT	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2622	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/665,178	JANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gregory V. Madden	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5 and 25-41* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-5 and 25-41* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *17 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☒ Other: *JP 2002-218389 A*.

DETAILED ACTION

New Examiner of Record

The prosecution of this application has been transferred to Examiner Gregory Madden from the docket of Examiner Gary C. Vieaux. Any inquiry concerning this Office Action or earlier communications should be directed to the current Examiner of record. Current contact information is provided in the last section of this communication.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-5, and newly added claims 25-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

First, the Examiner notes that the Applicant has amended claim 1 to both overcome the objection related to the lack of antecedent basis, as well as to clearly define the previously omitted steps, as set forth in the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of the previous office action. Thus, the Examiner withdraws both the objection to claim 1, as well as the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection to claims 1 and 3-5. Please refer to the action on the merits of claims 1 and 3-5 below.

Next, referring to Pg. 9 of the Remarks, the Applicant argues that the Kuwayama reference fails to teach that the user information is input to the camera immediately after the camera is powered on, as amended claim 1 and newly-submitted claims 28 and 34 now set forth. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Noting Col. 4, Lines 29-37, Col. 6, Lines 57-67, and Fig. 4a, Kuwayama teaches that immediately after the user turns on the power (step 200), the user is prompted to enter an instruction (418), either via password or through input fingerprint data. In this way, the Examiner believes that Kuwayama does receive user identification information immediately after the camera is turned on, as the

user is prompted to enter the information after the power is turned on, and no other operations are performed without the user identification information being submitted to the camera.

Finally, referring to Pgs. 9 and 10 of the Remarks, the Applicant argues that the user information being input to the camera is fingerprint information, not an alphanumeric password, as is claimed in newly-added claims 26-28, 40, and 41. While the Examiner agrees that Kuwayama does only teach the input of fingerprint information as the user information, the Applicant's arguments are considered moot in view of a new ground of rejection. As will be set forth in more detail below, the Gennetten et al. reference (U.S. Pat. 6,771,901) teaches a camera configured for multiple users, wherein user information is input to the camera either via fingerprint information or alphanumeric password (See Figs. 3-4 and Col. 2, Lines 39-67). The Examiner believes that the Kuwayama reference in view of the Gennetten reference sufficiently teaches the use of an alphanumeric password as the user identification information as claimed in claims 26-28, 40, and 41, the rejections of which are set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuwayama (U.S. Pat. 7,154,536).

First, considering **claim 34**, the Kuwayama reference teaches a method for identifying a user of a digital camera that is used by multiple users, the method comprising detecting activation of the digital camera by a user (Step 200, power on), immediately after the detecting step, prompting the user for user identification information (Step 202, user is prompted for identification information, i.e. fingerprint), determining if the user is a registered user according to the identification information received from the

user (Step 224, registered user YES), and if the user is determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, directing image files, which result from the user performing work on the camera, to be stored to and retrieved from a user-specific folder (as shown in Col. 4, Line 59 – Col. 5, Line 5). See also Figs. 1A, 1B, 4A, 4B, and Col. 6, Line 46 – Col. 9, Line 35 of Kuwayama.

As for **claim 35**, the limitations of claim 34 are set forth above, and the Kuwayama reference also discloses that the method further comprises protecting at least one of the user-specific folders and at least one image file of the image files from being accessed by other users, as is taught in Col. 8, Line 64 – Col. 9, Line 17.

Considering **claim 36**, again the limitations of claim 34 are taught above, and Kuwayama teaches that the determining step comprises comparing the user identification information with user information in a data structure relative to the multiple users (at step 222 in Fig. 4B).

In regard to **claim 37**, Kuwayama teaches the limitations of claim 34 above, and Kuwayama further teaches that the designating step further comprises determining if the user-specific folder exists in the user-removable storage medium (step 226), and if the user-specific folder is determined to not exist (YES at step 226), creating a new folder (step 220, create a folder). Please refer to Figs. 4A and 4B and Col. 3, Lines 34-49.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 25-32, 38, 40, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwayama (U.S. Pat. 7,154,536) in view of Gennetten et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,771,901).

First, in regard to **claim 1**, the Kuwayama reference teaches a method for identifying users in a digital including an image photographing unit (solid state imaging device 20) photographing an image of an object, an image processing unit (signal processor 28) performing a predetermined image processing to a photographed image from the image photographing unit and outputting the processing image, a data storing unit (memory 30) temporarily storing the image output from the image processing unit (28), and a recording medium (recording medium 48) inserted in a recording medium interface (card interface 50) and storing the digital image data, in which multiple users use the digital camera, the method comprising the steps of:

a) immediately after the digital camera is turned on (step 200; power on) according to a command by a user, receiving user identification information (i.e. the user is prompted to enter an instruction (418), either via password or through input fingerprint data, in step 202),

b) determining whether matched use identification information exists by comparing the input user identification information (input fingerprint information) and user identification information stored in the digital camera relative to each of the multiple users (compare fingerprints at step 222),

d1) if in Step (b) it is determined that the matched user identification exists (registered user YES in step 224), it is determined whether an existing folder used by the identified user exists (step 226),

d2) if in Step (d1) it is determined that the existing folder used by the identified user exists (NO in step 226), designating the existing folder as a location to store images that are captured by the identified user (as shown in Col. 4, Line 59 – Col. 5, Line 5),

d3) otherwise, if in Step (d1) it is determined that the existing folder used by the identified user does not exist (YES in step 226), creating a new folder for the identified user (step 220, create a folder), and

e) the user performing work (step 234, execute instruction) using the digital camera. Please refer further to Figs. 1A, 1B, 4A, 4B, and Col. 6, Line 46 – Col. 9, Line 35 of Kuwayama in regard to the above method.

What the Kuwayama reference fails to explicitly teach, though, is that if in Step (b) it is determined that the matched user identification exists (registered user YES in step 224), loading a setting of the digital camera corresponding to the matched user identification information, and storing a setting state of the camera as information intrinsic to the user according to a turn-off command by the user. However, noting the Gennetten reference, Gennetten teaches a digital camera having a method for identifying users that includes receiving user identification information (Step 602 of Fig. 7), either via a fingerprint sensor or an alphanumeric keypad, retrieving settings of the digital camera corresponding to the matched user identification information (Step 604), performing work using the digital camera according to the user settings (Steps 606-610), and storing a setting state of the camera as information intrinsic to the user according to a turn-off command by the user (automatically stores settings at completion of the users last photography session). Please refer to Figs. 1-7, Col. 2, Lines 39-67, and Col. 5, Line 49 – Col. 6, Line 13 of Gennetten. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the loading of settings of the digital camera corresponding to matched user identification information, as taught by Gennetten, with the use of existing user folders for storage corresponding to matched user identification information, as taught by Kuwayama. One would have been motivated to do so because, as Gennetten teaches in Col. 1, Lines 10-28, it is often difficult and time-consuming for users to adjust the settings of the camera with each use, particularly when multiple users share a camera. Thus, by loading user-preferred settings based on user identification information, the multiple users of the camera will not have to be concerned with the settings of the previous user.

As for **claim 5**, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, and the Kuwayama reference also discloses that there is a step of setting read protection with respect to an image filed stored in the user folder after Step (e), as is taught in Col. 8, Line 64 – Col. 9, Line 17.

In regard to **claim 25**, again the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, and Kuwayama teaches that before Step (a), a command initiated by the user for turning on the digital camera is detected (Step 200 in Fig. 4a), and substantially immediately after the detecting step, prompting the user to input user identification information (Step 202 in Fig. 4a). See also Col. 4, Lines 29-37.

Considering **claim 26**, the limitations of claim 25 are taught above by Kuwayama in view of Gennetten, and while Kuwayama does teach that the input user identification information is fingerprint information, the Gennetten reference teaches that the input user identification information can be either fingerprint information (via fingerprint sensor 430) or an alphanumeric password (entered via keypad 330), as is taught in Col. 2, Lines 39-67.

In regard to **claim 27**, the limitations of claim 26 are taught above, and while Gennetten does not specify that the alphanumeric password includes at least four characters, the Kuwayama reference shows that a password is entered so as to allow a new user to create a folder, wherein the password contains a four-digit number (See Col. 7, Lines 16-30 of Kuwayama).

Next, regarding **claim 28**, the Kuwayama reference teaches a method for identifying a user of a digital camera that is used by multiple users, the method comprising detecting activation of the digital camera by a user (Step 200, power on), immediately after the detecting step, prompting the user for user identification information (Step 202, user is prompted for identification information), determining if the user is a registered user according to the identification information received from the user (Step 224, registered user YES), and if the user is determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, designating a user-specific folder as a location for storing and retrieving image files resulting from the user performing work with the camera (as shown in Col. 4, Line 59 – Col. 5, Line 5). See also Figs. 1A,

1B, 4A, 4B, and Col. 6, Line 46 – Col. 9, Line 35 of Kuwayama. What Kuwayama fails to explicitly teach is that the user is prompted for an alphanumeric password, and that it is determined that the user is a registered user according to the alphanumeric password received from the user. However, the Gennetten reference teaches a digital camera having a method for identifying users that includes receiving user identification information (Step 602 of Fig. 7), either via a fingerprint sensor or via alphanumeric password inputted through an alphanumeric keypad (See Figs. 1-7, Col. 2, Lines 39-67, and Col. 5, Line 49 – Col. 6, Line 13 of Gennetten). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the use of an alphanumeric password for user identification, as done by Gennetten, with the user identification method of Kuwayama. One would have been motivated to do so because by incorporating an alphanumeric password input means rather than a fingerprint identification means, the camera can include much less complicated circuitry, thereby cutting the cost and power consumption of the camera.

As for **claim 29**, the limitations of claim 28 are set forth above, and the Kuwayama reference also discloses that the method further comprises protecting at least one of the user-specific folders and at least one image file of the image files from being accessed by other users, as is taught in Col. 8, Line 64 – Col. 9, Line 17.

Considering **claim 30**, again the limitations of claim 28 are taught above, and Kuwayama teaches that the determining step comprises comparing the user identification information with user information in a data structure relative to the multiple users (at step 222 in Fig. 4B). Again, while the user identification information of Kuwayama is fingerprint information of the user, the Gennetten reference teaches comparing an alphanumeric password inputted by a user with user information in a data structure relative to multiple users, as is taught in Figs. 1-7, Col. 2, Lines 39-67, and Col. 5, Line 49 – Col. 6, Line 13.

In regard to **claim 31**, Kuwayama in view of Gennetten teaches the limitations of claim 28 above, and Kuwayama further teaches that the designating step further comprises determining if the user-specific folder exists in the user-removable storage medium (step 226), and if the user-specific folder is determined to not exist (YES at step 226), creating a new folder (step 220, create a folder). Please refer again to Figs. 4A and 4B, as well as Col. 3, Lines 34-49.

As for **claim 32**, again the limitations of claim 28 are taught above, and the Gennetten reference further teaches that if the user is determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, loading a setting of the digital camera according to the user identification (e.g. alphanumeric password). See Figs. 1-7, Col. 2, Lines 39-67, and Col. 5, Line 49 – Col. 6, Line 13.

As for **claim 38**, again the limitations of claim 34 are taught above by Kuwayama, and the Gennetten reference further teaches that if the user is determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, loading a setting of the digital camera according to the user identification (e.g. alphanumeric password). See Figs. 1-7, Col. 2, Lines 39-67, and Col. 5, Line 49 – Col. 6, Line 13.

Considering **claim 40**, the limitations of claim 34 are taught above by Kuwayama, and while Kuwayama does teach that the input user identification information is fingerprint information, the Gennetten reference teaches that the input user identification information can be either fingerprint information (via fingerprint sensor 430) or an alphanumeric password (entered via keypad 330), as is taught in Col. 2, Lines 39-67.

Finally, in regard to **claim 41**, the limitations of claim 40 are taught above, and while Gennetten does not specify that the alphanumeric password includes at least four characters, the Kuwayama reference shows that a password is entered so as to allow a new user to create a folder, wherein the password contains a four-digit number (See Col. 7, Lines 16-30 of Kuwayama).

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwayama (U.S. Pat. 7,154,536) in view of Gennetten et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,771,901), further in view of McIntyre (U.S. Pat. 5,715,487).

Next, in regard to **claim 3**, the limitations of claim 1 are set forth above by Kuwayama in view of Gennetten, but what neither Kuwayama nor Gennetten teaches is that if it is determined that the input user identification information does not match the user information stored in the digital camera relative to each of the multiple users, determining whether a frequency of input of the user identification information exceeds a predetermined number and, if it is determined that the frequency does not exceed the predetermined number, moving to Step (a). However, noting the McIntyre reference, McIntyre teaches a camera having information regarding users stored therein (password information), wherein it is determined whether a frequency of input of the user identification information (password entered at Step 122) exceeds a predetermined number (i.e. number of attempts is greater than three) and, if it is determined that the frequency does not exceed the predetermined number (i.e. is not greater than three), moving to the beginning step (Step 110, prompting the user for password). Please refer to Fig. 8A and Col. 6, Line 59 – Col. 7, Line 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the detection of frequency of input of the user identification information, as taught by McIntyre, with the input of user identification information of Kuwayama in view of Gennetten. One would have been motivated to do so because by allowing a predetermined number of attempts at entering user identification information, mistakes in entering the information would not prohibit a user from eventually using the camera, while an unusual amount of mistakes in entering the information would prohibit an unauthorized user from gaining entry to a user's settings and/or images.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwayama (U.S. Pat. 7,154,536) in view of Gennetten et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,771,901), further in view of Bates et al (U.S. Pat. 6,930,707).

Next, in regard to **claim 4**, again the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, and the Kuwayama reference further teaches that if it is determined in Step (b) that the input identification information does not match the stored user information (YES in step 226), a new user folder is created (step 220, create new folder). Please refer again to Figs. 4A and 4B. What neither Kuwayama nor Gennetten teaches is that when it is determined that the input identification information does not match the stored user information, the method includes loading a setting of the digital camera as a basic setting. However, noting the Bates reference, Bates teaches a digital camera that allows the input of user identification information (via iris scan in step 703), wherein if it is determined that the input identification information does not match the stored user information (no match is found at step 705), loading a setting of the digital camera as a basic, or default, setting (step 707). Please refer to Fig. 7A and Col. 8, Lines 14-54 of Bates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the loading of basic settings in the digital camera when a new user is determined, as done by Bates, with the determination of a new user by Kuwayama in view of Gennetten. One would have been motivated to do so because by providing basic, or default, settings to an unregistered user, the new user is not forced to use the predetermined settings of a separate user, thereby allowing the new user to determine their own optimal settings for future use in the multi-user camera.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwayama (U.S. Pat. 7,154,536) in view of Gennetten et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,771,901), further in view of McIntyre (U.S. Pat. 5,715,487), and still further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,930,707).

Considering **claim 33,** the limitations of claim 28 are taught above, and while Kuwayama in view of Gennetten does teach creating a new user folder (step 220 of Fig. 4A) when the user is not determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, Kuwayama in view of Gennetten does not teach that if the user is not determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, repeating the querying and determining steps a predetermined number of times, and if the user is not determined to be a registered user relative to the repeating step, loading a setting of the digital camera as a basic setting. However, noting the McIntyre reference, McIntyre teaches a camera having information regarding users stored therein (password information), wherein it is determined whether a frequency of input of the user identification information (password entered at Step 122) exceeds a predetermined number (i.e. number of attempts is greater than three) and, if it is determined that the frequency does not exceed the predetermined number (i.e. is not greater than three), moving to the beginning step (Step 110, prompting the user for password). Please refer to Fig. 8A and Col. 6, Line 59 – Col. 7, Line 4. Also, in view of the Bates reference, Bates discloses a digital camera that allows the input of user identification information (via iris scan in step 703), wherein if it is determined that the input identification information does not match the stored user information (no match is found at step 705), loading a setting of the digital camera as a basic, or default, setting (step 707). Please refer to Fig. 7A and Col. 8, Lines 14-54 of Bates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the detection of frequency of input of the user identification information, as taught by McIntyre, and the loading of basic settings in the digital camera when a new user is determined, as taught by Bates, with the method of Kuwayama in view of Gennetten. One would have been motivated to do so because by allowing a predetermined number of attempts at entering user identification information, mistakes in entering the information would not prohibit a user from eventually using the camera, while an unusual amount of mistakes in entering the information would prohibit an unauthorized user from gaining entry to a user's settings and/or images. Also, by providing basic, or default, settings to an unregistered user, the new user is not forced to use the

predetermined settings of a separate user, thereby allowing the new user to determine their own optimal settings for future use in the multi-user camera.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuwayama (U.S. Pat. 7,154,536) in view of McIntyre (U.S. Pat. 5,715,487), further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,930,707).

Considering **claim 39,** the limitations of claim 34 are taught above, and while Kuwayama does teach creating a new user folder (step 220 of Fig. 4A) when the user is not determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, Kuwayama does not teach that if the user is not determined to be a registered user relative to the determining step, repeating the querying and determining steps a predetermined number of times, and if the user is not determined to be a registered user relative to the repeating step, loading a setting of the digital camera as a basic setting. However, noting the McIntyre reference, McIntyre teaches a camera having information regarding users stored therein (password information), wherein it is determined whether a frequency of input of the user identification information (password entered at Step 122) exceeds a predetermined number (i.e. number of attempts is greater than three) and, if it is determined that the frequency does not exceed the predetermined number (i.e. is not greater than three), moving to the beginning step (Step 110, prompting the user for password). Please refer to Fig. 8A and Col. 6, Line 59 – Col. 7, Line 4. Also, in view of the Bates reference, Bates discloses a digital camera that allows the input of user identification information (via iris scan in step 703), wherein if it is determined that the input identification information does not match the stored user information (no match is found at step 705), loading a setting of the digital camera as a basic, or default, setting (step 707). Please refer to Fig. 7A and Col. 8, Lines 14-54 of Bates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the detection of frequency of input of the user identification information, as taught by McIntyre, and the loading of basic settings in the digital camera when a new

user is determined, as taught by Bates, with the method of Kuwayama. One would have been motivated to do so because by allowing a predetermined number of attempts at entering user identification information, mistakes in entering the information would not prohibit a user from eventually using the camera, while an unusual amount of mistakes in entering the information would prohibit an unauthorized user from gaining entry to a user's settings and/or images. Also, by providing basic, or default, settings to an unregistered user, the new user is not forced to use the predetermined settings of a separate user, thereby allowing the new user to determine their own optimal settings for future use in the multi-user camera.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Takahashi (U.S. Pat. 7,215,793): Note Figs. 3 and 5

Steinberg et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,433,818): Note Fig. 3

Okumura (JP Pub. 2002-218389)

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory V. Madden whose telephone number is 571-272-8128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc Yen Vu can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Gregory Madden
July 10, 2007

NGOC-YEN VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER